

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,314	01/18/2002	Bradford Russell Wood	SC 036	4785
7590 02/23/2006		EXAMINER		
Guy McLung			POPOVICS, ROBERT J	
PMB 347 16690 Champion Forest Drive			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Spring, TX 77379-7023			1724	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				\sim
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/051,314	WOOD ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Robert J. Popovics	1724	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	Idress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDONE to the application to become the application to be applica	mely filed ys will be considered timel the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 N</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr		e merits is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 62-89 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 62-89 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CI	• •
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage
Attachmen	` •			
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	D-152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims **62-89** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Nye (US 6,120,650)**. See columns 3 and 4, where condensing unit, oil **cyclone**, secondary separator and oil/water separator, for example, are discussed.

Claims **62-89** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Wood (US 6,106,733)**. See Figures 4-6 where a thermal plant 104, **centrifuge** 132, shaker 102, condensing unit 210 and oil/water separator 211, are disclosed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed **November 17, 2005** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has argued:

Neither Nye nor Wood has any teaching or suggestion of a dual component mechanical separation system for separating solids. Neither references has any teaching or suggestion of limitations (b), (c), or (d) listed above.

The term "dual," is given its broadest reasonable interpretation. The systems of Nye and Wood both disclose systems employing at least two components.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert J. Popovics at telephone number (571) 272-1164.

Robert James Popovics Primary Examiner Art Unit 1724

CHO

February 21, 2006